

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 626

CS 504 441

AUTHOR Thomas, David A.  
TITLE Research in Forensics from the Past Five Years: Trends, Omissions, and Recommendations.  
PUB DATE Nov 83  
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (69th, Washington, DC, November 10-13, 1983).  
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)  
  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Communication (Thought Transfer); \*Communication Research; Debate; \*Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; \*Persuasive Discourse; \*Research Methodology; \*Speech Communication; Speech Instruction; Speech Skills  
IDENTIFIERS \*Theory Development

## ABSTRACT

A review of literature in the speech communication field from 1978 to 1983 reveals developments emerging in the area of forensics, while a review of the contributions to theories of debate analysis reveals advances in both policy systems theory and in hypothesis testing. Although much of the research is directed toward forensics educators, it is closely tied to argumentation and decision theory, thereby offering the potential for making a significant contribution to knowledge in the wider scholarly discipline. The research in individual events shows a few qualitative studies, a number of essays devoted to a coherent and indepth analysis of a specific theme (argument in individual events), and some critiques and proposals for future research. The literature related to nonpolicy debating is still in its early stages of development and can be characterized as anecdotal, subjective, and exhortatory.  
(HOD)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.  
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE  
position or policy.

ED240626

RESEARCH IN FORENSICS FROM THE PAST FIVE YEARS:  
TRENDS, OMISSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

David A. Thomas  
University of Houston

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David A. Thomas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504441

RESEARCH IN FORENSICS FROM THE PAST FIVE YEARS:  
TRENDS, OMISSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

David A. Thomas  
University of Houston

presented to the SCA convention, Washington, D. C., Nov. 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>TOPIC</u>                                   | <u>PAGE</u> |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Background                                     | 1           |
| Purpose of this Paper                          | 3           |
| New Developments in the Past Five Years        | 5           |
| New Textbooks                                  | 6           |
| New Publication Outlets                        | 6           |
| Trends in Forensics Research                   | 7           |
| Methods of Debate Analysis                     | 8           |
| Individual Events                              | 13          |
| Non-Policy Debate                              | 16          |
| Recommendations                                | 19          |
| Establishing an Educational Point of View      | 19          |
| Encouraging Better Research                    | 20          |
| The Need for More Publication Outlets          | 22          |
| Target Areas for Further Research in Forensics | 23          |
| Paradigms for Debate Analysis and Judging      | 23          |
| Individual Events                              | 24          |
| Non-Policy Debating                            | 24          |
| Surveys of the "State of the Union"            | 25          |
| Summary                                        | 27          |
| Endnotes                                       | 28          |

RESEARCH IN FORENSICS FROM THE PAST FIVE YEARS:  
TRENDS, OMISSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

David A. Thomas  
University of Houston

presented to the SCA convention, Washington, D. C., Nov. 1983

Background

The Sedalia Conference Report. The original impetus for today's program was the National Developmental Conference on Forensics held at Sedalia Retreat House near Denver in 1974. Some thirty conferees met under the direction of Dr. George Ziegelmüller to consider broad issues related to the world of forensics. Prior to the Sedalia Conference, a special issue of JAF published articles surveying the scope and status of forensics activities in colleges and high schools, and also reviewing the existing research literature related to forensics.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Ziegelmüller's plans for the conference divided the subject matter into four broad areas: Future Roles and Goals; Theory and Practice; Research and Scholarship; and Preparation, Status, and Rewards. Prior to the conference, a delphi study was performed to identify issues and concerns within each of the four areas. Essays were commissioned to keynote each area, and all conferees were assigned to one of the areas as a "task force" to respond to the position papers. Thus, all conferees had devoted considerable time and thought to the conference in advance. The actual work of the conference had each of the four task forces generating sets of recommendations for their focal areas of interest. At the conclusion of the conference, Dr. James H. McBath edited the proceedings, subsequently published in book form as Forensics As Communication: The Argumentative Perspective (1975).<sup>2</sup> The book includes all the recommendations (with brief rationales for each); keynote addresses by

Scott Nobles and Samuel Becker (representing the co-sponsors of the conference, the AFA and the SCA); the Delphi study report; and the four position papers with excerpts from the conferees' responses.

Forensics as Communication is a vital document for understanding the present status of research in forensics. Every element of its contents included a call for research. The delphi study produced 110 propositions after four rounds of questionnaires, of which 20 were categorized as "research and scholarship"; but by my estimation, many of the other statements generated by the conferees within other task force interest areas were also direct calls for more research. All four of the position papers included calls for more research. All four of the sets of recommendations included at least one recommendation that research should be conducted on some specific problem area. Dr. Becker's keynote address was devoted entirely to his perceptions of the needs and opportunities for research in forensics. Perhaps a fair description of the book is that it reported on what we do in forensics; it articulated disagreements over aspects of what we do; it speculated on what we should be doing; and it candidly admitted to significant gaps between these realities and ideals -- gaps which serve as obvious targets for research.

It is not feasible to repeat all of its recommendations and directives for research in this brief paper.<sup>3</sup> Within the context of the forensics world viewed by the conferees (overwhelmingly dominated by intercollegiate debate tournament activities in the NDT circuit), it demonstrated that numerous potential research problems existed. The recommendations of the task force on research and scholarship included a two-page outline of "questions that illustrate topics for research" in line with four main concentrations: a) delineate the nature of the field, b) investigate the relationship between theory and practice, c) interrelate forensics with

other disciplines, and d) describe, evaluate, and develop teaching methods (pp. 34-36). A typical "research question" drawn from each of these concentrations reads as follows:

A. Nature of the Field.

1. What is the role of argumentation in small group communication?

B. Theory and Practice.

1. What is the role of nonverbal communication in argumentation?

C. Other disciplines.

1. How do economic decision theory, political decision theory, and game theory contribute to argumentation?

D. Pedagogy.

1. What are the effects of different teaching methods in cocurricular instructional settings on students of varying ages?

Each of these four concentrations of illustrative research questions includes at least eight items for consideration, and each is designed to stimulate whole families or programs of research projects.

Historically, the Sedalia conference predated the mushrooming popularity of CEDA debate and intercollegiate individual events tournaments. There was an occasional mention of the need to study value argumentation and/or individual forensics events; but both were decidedly small eddies along the mainstreams of interest felt by the conferees. Since the perceptual lens through which forensics was consistently viewed was "the argumentative perspective," there are those today who are just as glad that the area of individual events was not examined very closely.

Purpose of this Paper

My assigned topic for this program turned out to be broader than I

wished to cover in the time allotted to me. It was originally supposed to be a review of the past ten years of research in forensics (i. e., since Sedalia), with an interpretation of its highlights, its shortcomings, and its mandates for us today as we look to the future.

However, I have chosen to limit myself to the past five years. One reason is that my contribution to the First Conference on Argumentation at Alta in 1979 was entitled, "Sedalia Plus Five: Forensics As Laboratory."<sup>4</sup> In that essay, I considered the changes I observed in the forensics world from 1974 to 1979. Using the Sedalia Conference's key term, "forensics as laboratory," I divided my paper for the first Alta conference into three parts, considering three senses of the term "laboratory." Those three parts of the paper reviewed the latest thrusts in forensics considered as a working laboratory, a learning laboratory, and a research laboratory. So I have already done one paper on the period covering the first five years of the past decade since Sedalia, part of which dealt with the topic of research.

There was not much research to review at that time, so my first Alta paper reviewed Ruth Anne Clark's guidelines for designing research. Research should concentrate on variables which reflect the core of a conceptual position, and it should focus on underlying processes rather than surface variables. The research I found in forensics tended to do neither.

I made a few recommendations for future research, mostly towards defining relevant theoretical bases for our forensics education. I was not alone in calling for more research at that time. There was a chorus of other voices crying in the wilderness after the Sedalia conference.

In particular, recall two other critics of forensics scholarship, each of whom chose a publication of a forensics honorary as the forum for his

message. First, Jack Rhodes wrote an article for Speaker and Gavel in 1978 about scholarship in the area of individual events. After surveying the available publications on the subject, including quite prominently one of my own little books called Speech Contest Activities, he said, "I am at a loss to explain this dearth of research....at this point I hope enough has been said to provoke more discussion and to encourage interested scholars to take up the challenge of research about the individual events."<sup>5</sup> As we shall see, there have been some interested scholars who heard his challenge; but in this paper, I will extend the challenge again.

The second call for research came from Dale Hample, who wrote in 1981 in The Forensic. Prof. Hample, a former debate champion and a former forensics director, provided an incisive description of what he saw as our research needs. He called for less emphasis on research about the forensics activities and more on the theoretical aspects of argumentation. He also urged the use of more sophisticated types of research methods, such as multivariate analysis, in testing our theories. He was especially enthusiastic about the idea of pursuing comprehensive programs of research, rather than unconnected, one-shot articles on varied subjects using varied methods and approaches for each. He was more optimistic than some of the earlier, despairing surveys of research had been. After all, he was able to include several articles from the journals of the late 1970's in his review.<sup>6</sup> I am happy to report today that just about all of Hample's recommendations are being pursued vigorously.

#### New Developments in the Past Five Years

In preparing my report for this convention, I surveyed the literature of the speech communication field from 1978-1983.<sup>7</sup> In my search, I discovered literally dozens of journal articles related to argumentation

and forensics. I found much more material on argumentation theory than on forensics, so much so that in fact a separate report is now needed on the past five years' research in general argumentation. This paper is therefore limited to research in forensics specifically. It is no longer possible to assert that a survey of our recent literature reveals nothing of importance to report.

New Textbooks. There have been several new textbooks published in argumentation and debate over the past five years. Since textbook publication is often contingent on having a commercially viable market, we have come to expect a small output in argumentation and debate as contrasted with some other disciplinary interests. With that in mind, it is important to note the recent appearance of textbooks which reflect some of the innovations in argumentation, and not simply reiterations of basic debating handbooks. The appearance of textbooks which emphasize general argumentation theory, applied argumentation in areas other than contest debate, etc., suggests that current publishers' market surveys disclose a potentially widespread dissemination of new ideas and new needs. Even in the area of debate textbooks, as distinct from argumentation theory textbooks, more and more chapters are devoted to abstract philosophical matters, and to approaches based on something other than logic and the stock issues.<sup>8</sup>

New Publication Outlets. Another preliminary observation to make is that there is a widening opportunity for publication of scholarly research in argumentation and forensics. It has been remarked on many occasions that the mushrooming growth of individual events and of value debating has been amazing. Yet rapid growth in any organization can also be productive of rapid transformation, confusion, and even of rapid decay. Only when an

educational organization establishes a serious publication outlet can it begin to display signs of maturity and stability.

Over the past five years, we have seen the publication of forensics related materials not only in JAF, and the established honoraries' journals, but we have also received the published Proceedings of three summer conferences on argumentation at Alta. CEDA has sponsored the collection and dissemination of articles in a series of four annual yearbooks under the editorship of Prof. Don Brownlee. This year, too, the first issue of the National Forensic Journal (sponsored by the National Forensic Association, dedicated to individual events) appeared, edited by Prof. Michael Kelley. While these materials are "for members only," I have included the sources for ordering copies in this footnote.<sup>9</sup> All these references were born within the past five years. Admittedly, an objective critical review of their contents must be mixed; but the fact of their existence is important in its own right. To the extent that forensics educators read and respond to them, a substantial body of permanent literature will be generated and refined. This development rarely occurs in an organization where the only function of its publication is to serve as a newsletter.

#### Trends in Forensics Research

A disclaimer at this point is necessary. In what follows, I do not claim or imply that I have incorporated all of the available references, nor even all of the "best" articles. Like Jack Rhodes, I have tried to confine myself to research-oriented material, and pass over pedagogical or opinion pieces. These may overlap in some cases. Due to the bulk of material, my selections for inclusion here might well have overlooked an article or paper that fills a need that my conclusions claim may exist. If

so, I must apologize to the authors. I attempted to cover a great deal of information, abstract its major themes, synthesize it, and draw some conclusions about its status. To the extent that I have overlooked important information in this effort, my concluding recommendations will need to be adjusted accordingly.

Methods of Debate Analysis. Prior to Sedalia in 1974, the primary focus of attention was on Rohrer and Lichtman's "policy systems approach."<sup>10</sup> As it grew in influence in the 1970's, articles began to appear concerning its implications, offshoots, and permutations—such as alternative justification cases, counterplan requirements, etc. In the mid-1970's, Zarefsky introduced a truly competitive approach to the policy systems approach, which he termed "hypothesis testing." During the past five years, there has been much debate and discussion in the literature comparing these two "paradigms" or approaches to debate analysis. There have been two "special forum" features in JAFA about the merits of these paradigms. In the first, Robert C. Rowland wrote an article entitled "Standards for Paradigm Evaluation," to which there were three replies: one by David Zarefsky, one by Lichtman and Rohrer, and one by Walter Ulrich.<sup>11</sup> More recently, JAFA carried another special forum on hypothesis testing, in which two articles (one by Jerome Corsi and one by Thomas Hollihan) attacked the paradigm, and Zarefsky and Henderson co-authored a reply.<sup>12</sup>

Further elaboration on debate analysis techniques have been presented by several authors. Michael Pfau contributed an extensive treatment of "incrementalism," divided into two articles for publication in JAFA, which moderated the reliance of policy systems analysis on a narrowly conceived projection of the expected costs and benefits of a given plan, or single piece of legislated change in a federal law. Pfau showed the importance of viewing policy changes more broadly, in context of their indirect effects

in a larger political and legislative environment.<sup>13</sup> Still, Pfau's articles fit squarely within the basic theory of policy systems analysis.

Another contribution which added further elaboration to the policy systems method of debate analysis was Vincent Follert's article on risk analysis. Follert pointed out some of the difficulties with attempting to apply a strict formula of risk analysis to policy decision making, particularly in realms of uncertainty or of political interest areas.<sup>14</sup>

At the 1983 Alta Conference, Prof. Tim Hynes added another contribution to the literature on policy systems analysis. In a paper entitled, "Can We Save Policy Making," he addressed Rowland's critique of the policy making paradigm, and offered to show how policy making fulfills Rowland's criteria of a good debate paradigm.<sup>15</sup> In the course of this paper, Hynes pointed out that public administration as a field entertains more than one "paradigm," or problem solving orientation. Thus, within a policy decision arena there may be competing paradigms. For instance, Hynes mentions that the role of "soft" or value-oriented variables may carry greater or lesser weight according to the paradigm in use; and that incrementalism may hold greater or lesser influence according to the nature of the problems at issue.

In my opinion, Hynes' paper is valuable not only for its elaboration on the policy making approach to analysis, but also for its insights into the nature and uses of the concept of a paradigm. Using Hynes' train of thought, it is less important to compare global or universal patterns of solving problems (e.g., hypothesis testing vs. policy making) than to identify the particular policy making (or hypothesis testing) paradigm most relevant to the resolution being debated as it would be selected and applied within the field most concerned. A debate over the President's use

of troops in the invasion of Grenada, for instance, would proceed more constructively if the competing paradigms for determining the legitimacy and value of military interventions were employed than if a comparison were made between "political" and "philosophical" viewpoints. For within the intervention policy arena, there would be competing paradigms leading to issues over the unilateral powers of the President vs. the advisory role of Congress; the comparative values of military vs. diplomatic solutions; the logistical and military strategic issues; the range of questions, in short, that would have to be confronted and disposed of by the relevant decision makers.

Policy systems and hypothesis testing represent different methods of analyzing a debate resolution, and of building cases for and against it. The question has often been raised, What happens in a debate in which the affirmative team and the negative team operate within different decision paradigms? To which Ulrich has devoted the past ten years to developing the "tabula rasa" or "blank slate" judging paradigm. Essentially, as Ulrich has developed it, the idea of tabula rasa is a judging stance which requires that when debaters disagree on the reigning paradigm in debate, they should make it another issue for the judge to decide based on the arguments presented about it during that debate. Ulrich's contribution has also become the center of controversy, for some forensics educators disagree on the appropriateness of taking such a non-interventionist judging stance; or at least on the degree to which such a stance should be extended. (My listing does not include all of Ulrich's papers, but his contribution to the 1981 JAF forum on paradigms is one of his articles which explains the tabula rasa notion.)

Balthrop provided another response to the task of judging in a debate between opposing paradigms, different from Ulrich's. Balthrop suggested a

judging stance he calls the "critic of argument," first in a contributed chapter to the revised edition of Advanced Debate, then in his published critique of an NDT final round, and most recently in an article for a future issue of JAJA.<sup>16</sup> In Balthrop's view, the judge is neither a partisan for a particular analytical scheme, nor a "blank slate" who is bound by the outcome of a given debate's clash over which paradigm should govern the judge in that round. Rather, the judge is a critic of the arguments presented in the debate, as a rhetorical critic is the judge of advocacy in all other settings. In this approach, the judge is free to be more autonomous and independent than in the tabula rasa judging position, consistent with the standards of rhetorical judgment being employed.

Hingstman's paper at the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation held at Alta last summer drew some parallels between debate paradigms, the judging process, and the developmental phases he has analyzed in the evolution of the discipline of philosophy. Among the insights he provided is the clear phenomenon of judge interaction with the debate round over the course of time. Using Balthrop's 1981 NDT final round critique as an example, Hingstman points out the inherent human information processing response by the debate judge to the debate in progress as dynamic and variable, which corresponds to the way humans engage in argumentation in ordinary language.

This insight raises questions about the legitimacy of judging paradigms which attempt to reconstruct a complex debate event of speeches and rebuttals, cases and refutations, issues raised, dropped, and transformed, as a unified and coherent articulation of a dispute to be criticized and judged in toto. That is, rather than wait until the end of the debate and try to assemble all of the issues in a comprehensive flow

sheet to make an ultimate determination of either a "policy system" or "hypothesis test" outcome, the judge engages in a continuing process of evaluation and response to arguments, speeches, and speakers as they occur. The decision thus relies on the same human faculties (and frailties) that debaters themselves are heir to. The crucial distinction in Hingstman's paper is the incorporation of time as an important feature in the judge's cognitive process of interaction with the debate.<sup>17</sup>

This review of the contributions to theories of debate analysis reveals advances in both policy systems theory (in its extensions and ramifications) and in hypothesis testing. These are both methods employed in case construction and advocacy for gaining decisions. We have also seen creative thinking about methods of arriving at just and rational decisions, notably Ulrich's tabula rasa and Balthrop's "criticism of argument," along with Hingstman's extension of these ideas into a more general theory of argumentation drawn from the philosophy of ordinary language. These latter contributions are not new paradigms for advocacy, such as hypothesis testing is; but rather perspectives or frameworks to be used by judges who must award decisions. However, they allow for the consideration of the analytical paradigms now in use, and also for newer paradigms yet to come (such as, perhaps, A. C. Snider's "game theory" paradigm, or whatever persuasive paradigms come forth in value debating.)

The nature of all this research on methods of debate analysis in policy controversies is philosophical and theoretical. It indicates a relatively sophisticated status of this sector of the forensics discipline. While much of the product of this research is intrinsically parochial and aimed chiefly towards forensics educators, it is also tied closely to argumentation and decision theory. Thus it offers the potential for making a significant contribution to knowledge in the wider scholarly discipline.

Individual Events. Since Jack Rhodes issued his challenge to the individual events community, it is gratifying to note at least four repositories for individual events research. First, JAF has continued to run articles on individual events subjects. Second, Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation, includes ten papers on individual events, which made up two programs at that conference. Third, as previously mentioned, the National Forensic Journal is now a reality. Fourth, Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation, includes a couple of papers on individual events among the sixteen forensics papers there.

Three research reports on individual events have appeared in JAF recently.<sup>18</sup> One article described the two national championship tournaments in individual events (sponsored by the AFA and the NFA) and surveyed the attitudes of the participants towards them. The other two articles I noted for this essay were studies in judging inter-rater reliability. One compared the judging criteria used by different categories of judges of persuasive speaking, and the other reported on the effects of training on judging reliability. These reports exhibited skillful use of empirical research methods; and as such, they responded to a frequent call for researchers to go beyond anecdotes and personal opinion.

The ten Dimensions of Argument papers on individual events all related to the general theme of argumentation. They fit into one of two programs: "Argumentation and Individual Events: A Theoretical Probe" and "The Application of Argument to Individual Events."<sup>19</sup> Most of the ten papers referred either directly or indirectly to the Sedalia Conference Report's "Definition Statement," where it said, "...forensics activities, including debate and individual events, are laboratories for helping students to

understand and communicate various forms of argument more effectively in a variety of contexts with a variety of audiences."<sup>20</sup> Most of the ten papers explicitly or implicitly accepted the argumentative perspective for individual events, and typically defined that concept in terms of traditional approaches to evidence, reasoning, structure, and other elements of a message. Most, but not all, implicitly or explicitly excluded oral interpretation from the group of individual events considered to be within the argumentative boundaries. Several of the papers were based wholly or in part on content analysis of contest speeches, ballots, tournament invitations, etc., to identify message elements that serve as indicators of argumentative discourse.

Two notable exceptions to the above generalizations about the papers were one essay by Jack Kay and another by Kathleen H. Olsen. Kay's essay, "Evidentiary Concerns in the Community of Individual Events," compared the theoretical view of evidence manifested in forensics events and contemporary argumentation theory, and made some recommendations for reforming individual events. Olsen asserted that argumentation theory is relevant to oral interpretation in the pre-performance decisions the interpreter must make regarding selections, abridgement, and audience analysis; and that it is also relevant to the criteria used by contest judges in rating and ranking performances.

It is my impression that the theme for this set of Alta essays reflected a tendency to try to force the events into a preconceived mold. The fact that the Sedalia Conference initially asserted that individual events are laboratories for argumentative communication, fortunately or unfortunately, seemed to lend an aura of received dogma to that perspective. Most of the papers, therefore, viewed the various forensics events as the natural environment, and asked, "What is it about this or

that particular event that reflects the argumentative perspective?" The answers to that question often took the form of pointing out the message elements of the compositions featured by the events—evidence, types of argument used, outline structure, etc. As a result, individual events may be regarded as exercises in Argument<sub>1</sub>, or argumentative products, not as communicative events.

One has to wonder, though, why the emphasis on argumentation in individual events? Apart from the Sedalia Conference statement, there is little to suggest the question. It may be more interesting and useful to classify some forensics events as laboratories in artistic expression, perhaps more so than to study them primarily as argumentative events. The premier issue of the National Forensic Journal features articles on ethics of proof in speech events, judging standards in forensics, tournament scheduling practices, oral interpretation action caucus report, and debate ethics. In contrast with the Dimensions of Argument essays, most of the articles in the National Forensic Journal convey a stronger reformist tone.<sup>21</sup> For instance, Thomas found in his survey of attitudes towards ethics in the speech events that most participants and coaches view individual events as contests first, educational activities next, and actual rhetorical events last. A corollary to that finding is that research needs to be done to determine the nature of the contest and/or the educational activity involved, and to align it with the aims of supporting departments.

Other NFA journal articles also called for reforms. The Action Caucus report on oral interpretation did not refer to forensics versions of oral interpretation as argumentative; and most of the commentary stated or implied that they are poor renditions of oral interpretation as well. The

article by Norbert Mills repeats the theme in his analysis of event descriptions in tournament invitations and ballot instructions, where he found a lack of specificity and a wide range of diversity in the available descriptions of the nature, purpose, and content of the individual events.

The Third Summer Conference on Argumentation at Alta last summer included at least two papers dealing with individual events embedded in the forensics programs there. In "Rhetorical Criticism as Argument: A Need for Social Criticism," John M. Murphy analyzed the inherent shortcomings in students' efforts to produce and present technically adequate rhetorical criticisms in the forensics tournament as currently structured; he advocated a major revision of the event to transform it into a new variety of contest more feasible for students to engage in.<sup>22</sup> And Jack Kay continued with the theme he launched in the Dimensions of Argument 1981 essay with "Rapprochement of World<sub>1</sub> and World<sub>2</sub>: Discovering the Ties Between Practical Discourse and Forensics."<sup>23</sup> Kay also questioned the match between most of the individual events and any real world analog, and he advocated major reforms in the types of events that he believes should be conducted for a closer (and hence more educationally justifiable) fit.

The published research in individual events shows considerable progress in both quality and amount in the past five years. There have been a few exemplary quantitative studies, set of essays devoted to a coherent and in-depth analysis of a specific theme (argument in individual events), and some thoughtful critiques and proposals for future improvements.

Non-Policy Debate. There is a large and growing body of literature related to non-policy, or value, debating. At least four general sources are available. First, the annual CEDA Yearbooks for the years 1980, 1981, 1982, and 1983 contain many articles of interest. Second, Jafa has also

carried a few articles related to value debating recently. Third, the publications of the forensics honoraries include materials related to value argumentation from time to time. (For instance, The Forensic of Fall, 1981, includes several articles under the theme, "To CEDA or Not To CEDA Debate Is the Question.") Finally, the Alta Conference Proceedings from 1981 and 1983 include papers on value argumentation.

The course of ideas about non-policy debating may be traced roughly as follows: First, articles describing the nature and scope of CEDA as an alternative to NDT appeared. Differences were seen in the educational goals as well as the substantive and/or theoretical problems of the new form of debate. One goal was to furnish a communication-centered event, in contrast to NDT's information-processing orientation. The implications of this difference were in preferred manners of style and delivery, along with the weight placed upon evidence in debates. Also, CEDA offered students the opportunity to discuss value resolutions instead of (or in addition to) policy resolutions.<sup>24</sup>

Next, greater emphasis was given to theoretical and argumentative articles dealing with the principles and methods for analyzing non-policy resolutions. The nature of presumption, burden of proof, and stock issues came into prominence. Attempts were seen both to adapt standard analytical methods from policy debate and also to generate innovative methods more suited to value argumentation than to policy analysis.<sup>25</sup>

Third, and currently, voices are beginning to be heard for integrating policy and non-policy debating, both at the theoretical level of issue analysis and also at the organizational levels (i.e., coordination and cooperation between NDT and CEDA). Louden and Austin urged forensics directors to see the sponsorship of both varieties of debate as meeting

diverse but complementary educational objectives.<sup>26</sup> On the level of argumentative theory, several authors have downplayed the distinction between value argumentation and policy argumentation. As likely as not, these contributions have been made by authors whose main experience and/or interests are in NDT, rather than CEDA. For instance, Dudezak (calling himself "relatively new to CEDA debate") contributed a paper to the 1983 Alta conference whose thesis was, "...that policy and value propositions are interdependent....I submit that the decision rules created by the value arguments require a manifestation in policy to be meaningful." (pp. 837, 838.) Rowland, in the same program, stated, "I have argued that there is little need for an independent form of debate concerning values, because values are integral to policies....value and policy debate are essentially similar;" and, "The sharp distinction which many theorists have drawn between value and policy debate is unfortunate. Values and policies are so intertwined that it is impossible to consider one without the other....values can be evaluated only by treating them as implicit policies." (pp. 829, 833.)<sup>27</sup>

Yet, at the same conference, reports were heard from researchers who employed empirical methods to investigate the differences between value and policy debate, or between CEDA and NDT. Lee, Lee, and Seeger conducted a national survey of forensics programs to discover how directors perceive the two activities, and found somewhat distinctive qualities between them. Not only were the researchers able to describe the programmatic differences in terms of squad size, tournament participation, budgets, etc., but also the attitudinal orientations that were expressed by those who were NDT or CEDA.<sup>28</sup> Hollihan, Riley, and Austin performed a content analysis of NDT and CEDA judges ballots to determine whether the judging standards differ according to the "vision" of the two forms of debate, and discovered that

there are significant differences reflected in ballot comments.<sup>29</sup>

Finally, Buckley collected questionnaire data from debate judges at some recent tournaments to discover whether they identified themselves as being aligned with one paradigm or another. Buckley's findings are very interesting in the diversity of responses gathered, and in his observation that, "Paradigm development...is a slow tedious process....Most programs and judges still have strong ties to traditional policy debate....it will be many years before completely independent influences can work their way." (p. 868.)<sup>30</sup>

The literature related to non-policy debating is still in its early stages of development, in keeping with the present period of growth of the activity itself. While its research output is substantial, and there are some examples of sophisticated research reports, the quality of some of its contributions may still be characterized as anecdotal, subjective, and exhortatory. The style and tone of some of the CEDA essays are more or less personal, casual, and simplistic. Yet these criticisms need not be considered fatal to the enterprise if the ideas contained in the non-policy debate publications are taken by future researchers as springboards for advances, and not as an inviolable charter for existence.

#### Recommendations

As a new decade begins after the Sedalia Conference report, a new forensics conference is now in the planning stages. What recommendations should be made for future research?

Establishing an Educational Point of View. A significant rationale or justification is needed for the support of forensics events, particularly for CEDA and individual events whose recent growth has occurred without the development of an antecedent pedagogical or philosophical basis to call its

own. Student popularity is not a very good rationale, though of course it is one of the major ones from the student's point of view. The activities thought of as most educationally beneficial are often the most highly elitist, or least popular. Winning trophies and awards is also a poor reason for the existence of a forensics program, though it may be a key argument to make to a student government's finance committee.

If forensics events are to become more than a club activity, then clear and defensible educational purposes for them must be established and maintained. Any cocurricular activity without a perceived educational rationale is forever at risk for the continuation of departmental or institutional support. A student activity perceived primarily as a club, with no perceived connection with an academic unit, may not need to conduct institutional research or self-studies to determine its priorities, strategies for greater effectiveness, or its real (or potential) contributions to student skills and knowledge acquisition. It also does not need faculty sponsorship or financial support, as administrations see it. At the point where forensics directors are terminated, and financial support is withdrawn, the future of forensics itself is jeopardized.

Encouraging Better Research. At present, many major universities do not bother with forensics. There are several notable exceptions, to be sure. But consider these indications for a moment. Forensics programs are scarce in the Big Ten, or at "University of \_\_\_\_ (fill in a major state university)" settings. Universities listed as among the leading research institutions, or doctoral degree-producing departments, frequently have weak or non-existent forensics programs. In many instances, successful (i.e., visibly winning) forensics programs are sponsored by institutions not generally identified as being among the most outstanding academic or research oriented ones. One can spend an illuminating hour or two scanning

the annual listing of tournaments to see which universities and colleges do (and do not) host events. Likewise, one may scan the NDT booklet to identify the schools represented in the last year's tournament (or throughout its lengthy history), or the Directory of AFA, NFA, or CEDA to see the affiliations of the bulk of their members.

A way must be found to persuade more of the speech communication departments of major universities with strong commitments to research and scholarship to sponsor active forensics programs. That alone would encourage other institutions to add or strengthen forensics offerings. More significantly, it would also increase the opportunities to generate more, and better, research in forensics. Perhaps more masters' and doctoral theses would be produced in forensics. If more decision makers in such institutions were persuaded of the educational worth of the activities in their program and budget priorities, and if such institutions would support forensics programs, then the amount and quality of forensics-related research should increase greatly.

Before the Sedalia conference, the authors who published most were almost entirely outside the forensics community. Perhaps as one result of Sedalia, there seem to be more articles and books produced by active forensics directors. Again, the reviews of their work must be regarded as mixed. But there is apparently more publication by active forensics directors today than ever before.

Another suggestion to generate higher research output in forensics is to encourage non-forensics researchers to add relevant projects to their agendas. Greater efforts should be attempted to strengthen a symbiotic relationship between scholarly researchers and forensics. While some active forensics directors are finding it more feasible to produce

publishable research (thanks to more released time due to coaching assistance and other departmental support), the "flight syndrome" still exists. In the area of argumentation scholarship (as contrasted with forensics activities per se), it is easy to spot many former forensics directors listed in bibliographies. Skill and success in publishing should not serve high-achieving individuals primarily as a ticket out of forensics which, too often, turns into a permanent separation.

Efforts must be made to nurture a genuine liaison between our producing scholars and the forensics activities from whence they emerged. There should be a mutual bond of respect for common interests between current and former forensics people. The Alta conferences have been marvelous mechanisms for achieving this. Convention programs, seminars during tournaments, and other opportunities for establishing rapport should be pursued. If our best researchers and writers abandon forensics as an interest area just because they are transferred away from active coaching to other duties by their departments, then forensics must constantly rely upon its ambitious active directors to produce the bulk of its research literature on their way up and out.

The Need for More Publication Outlets. Steps should be taken to allow for improvement. For instance, the repeated call for a journal or outlet for pedagogical articles (by George Ziegelmueller, among many others) is so far largely ignored, and still sorely needed. If a primary reason for the existence of forensics activities is to be a laboratory, then there must be a place to publish articles that focus on "how to teach," research reports on testing the performance gains in target student groups resulting from forensics education, and the like.

As a former journal editor, I can testify to the great dilemma that exists in trying to allocate scarce space resources to competing

contributors, especially when the subject matter or research method of a whole class of articles, the pedagogical arena, is at an inherent competitive disadvantage when compared with other types of research and scholarship. The National Forensic Journal is setting a good example by openly espousing an editorial purpose to serve forensics personnel as teachers, as well as researchers and scholars. Other journals should do so also. More importantly, the forensics community may now be large and strong enough to support a new journal dedicated to pedagogy.

#### Target Areas for Further Research in Forensics.

Paradigms for Debate Analysis and Judging. At the recent Alta Summer Conference, Donn Parson contributed an essay entitled, "Root Metaphors and Terministic Screens: Another Look at Paradigms."<sup>31</sup> Parson observed that the current status of debate paradigm development is similar to that of children saying (1) "My little red wagon is better than your little red wagon," (2) "I have a new red wagon -- so there;" and (3) "My new red wagon can hold more than your red wagon." Given Hynes' suggestion that paradigms are different orientations to decision making within a given discipline, and given Buckley's observation that viable paradigms may be several years away in non-policy arenas, it seems reasonable to recommend that research should continue in the direction of identifying and describing competing paradigms and their related decision methodologies within the fields that subsume the resolutions and issues chosen for academic debate. Rather than search for a single, overarching viewpoint towards conflict resolution that ought to apply to any and every type of argument situation, perhaps the time is right to look in the opposite direction. What paradigms and decision methods are most relevant to legal issues? To public administration of domestic welfare programs? To the identification and valuation of public

(or cultural) principles of greatest concern to decision makers in various fields that generate conflict? And, of course, to the legislation of policies in international and national problem areas.

Individual Events. Greater efforts should be made to develop a body of research findings in the individual events comparable to those in debate. Most of the progress in research in the past decade has been in argumentation-related areas, or in debate theory and practice. The previous experience with the Sedalia Conference and its published report, Forensics As Communication, should prove to be an advantage. If, in that document, an editor should substitute "individual events" wherever "debate" appears, no doubt there would be much in its analysis of the roles and goals of forensics, theory and practice, research and scholarship, and the status of her professionals that would still apply.

Non-Policy Debating. Similarly, those who are interested in value debating should begin to accumulate a larger empirical data base. Those interested in CEDA as a unique alternative to the NDT form of debate must develop a stronger body of research. Don Brownlee has done a yeoman's service in producing the annual CEDA Yearbook for four years to serve as an outlet dedicated to CEDA publications. In the history of many of our speech communication sub-disciplines, the literature that emerged initially was in the form of reactions against whatever older paradigm the new disciples were trying to get away from. In the case of CEDA, we hope for, and expect, a more mature, complete program of research to emerge, and be partly based upon, its earlier reaction and opinion articles. In particular, unless the CEDA leadership is willing to see the uniqueness of value debate co-opted by its NDT-oriented new members who claim that CEDA and NDT are essentially the same after all, there must be an acceptable, constructive, grounded theoretical explanation of the special features of

value argumentation.

Surveys of the "State of the Union." Jack Howe's annual reports give a factual view of the "state of the CEDA union." Prochaska wrote a doctoral dissertation reporting on his 1980 survey of forensics in two-year institutions, which he subsequently reported in a Jafa article.<sup>32</sup> There is no "state of the activity" report which describes and summarizes the nature and scope of individual events, of NDT participants, or an aggregate view of the field as a whole. We can speculate that there are many tournaments, many schools that sponsor squads, many students entered in tournament events, and significant budget allocations expended on individual events. However, it would be preferable to survey the field on a systematic basis.

The existing research into the roles and goals of forensics events, especially individual events and value debate, should continue. The reformist thrusts by Jack Kay and others directed towards establishing changes in forensics events to make them more educationally valid is constructive and should be encouraged. Of course, caution should also be observed in proposing (let alone implementing) major changes in forensics events without first establishing a defensible reason for change. The radical stance is always easy to assume if it is not accompanied by a concomitant responsibility for the alternative forms that may result from the reforms advocated.

A suggestion for conducting future research into the attitudes and values of the forensics community is to initiate qualitative research projects, drawn from ethnomethodological bases. Field studies, case studies, participant-observation studies, discourse analysis, and similar research methods usually characterized as qualitative rather than quantitative, offer the potential for busy forensics directors to exploit

what has been their greatest limitation: intensive immersion in the cultural environment of forensics. Qualitative research methods also offer unique advantages over quantitative approaches in that they are better suited for exploring values or soft variables in human interactions. Rather than try to conduct independent research projects outside of, and in addition to, their time consuming forensics tasks, forensics directors could design and conduct research inside, and intrinsic to, those tasks. In this way, data could be gathered and interpreted for purposes of clarifying our basic roles and goals in more authentic ways. Moreover, unless forensics personnel undertake this type of research, it is certain that no one else will.

### Summary

When I graduated from Hardin-Simmons University, Dean H. B. Smith told me a little story. He said that getting a college degree was something like chipping away for four years at a stone wall, and finally breaking a small hole all the way through it. When you look through the hole you have made in the wall, you can see the wide expanse of a whole ocean out there you hardly knew existed. The Dean encouraged me to regard the process of education in that way, to see that a college degree is a milestone marking a point when you are just beginning to realize how much there remains to be learned.

In this paper, we have reviewed the body of research literature in forensics which has been published in the past five years, not much longer than the span of time required for obtaining a bachelor's degree. The little analogy about coming to realize how much yet remains to be done, based on what has been accomplished up to now, holds true for research in forensics as well as for college graduation. Of course, I do not mean to imply that studies in forensics began only five years ago merely because this paper has concentrated on that period of time. But the analogy illustrates the principle that much of our previous research has served more to clarify what questions need to be asked than to offer the answers.

In this paper, we have reviewed the status of research in forensics from the past five years. The output in policy debate analysis, individual events studies, and non-policy practices, has been wide-ranging and stimulating. Some, though not all, has come close to the goals of exploring the central core of our discipline instead of its surface variables. It has laid the foundation for serious research to begin. Hopefully, this paper has charted the waters for the next Sedalia conference on forensics, at least to the extent of pointing in the right directions.

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>JAJA, 10 (Winter 1974), whole issue.

<sup>2</sup>James H. McBath, ed., Forensics As Communication: The Argumentative Perspective (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1975).

<sup>3</sup>Some noteworthy sections of Forensics As Communication related to research needs include: Recommendations Adopted By the Conference, "Research and Scholarship", pp. 34-41; Samuel Becker, "Research Needs in Forensic Communication," (keynote address) pp. 59-62; John C. Reinard and John E. Crawford, "Project Delphi: Assessment of Value Judgments on Forensics," pp. 63-80. The Position Papers and Responses include Malcolm O. Sillars and David Zarefsky, "Future Roles and Goals of Forensics," especially the section on "Research Role of Forensics," pp. 90-91; and Richard D. Rieke and Bernard L. Brock, "Research and Scholarship in Forensics," pp. 129-142. It must be reiterated, however, that there are suggestions, recommendations, admonitions, and directives for many types of research needs throughout this book.

Moreover, a major portion of the book's recommendations have not yet been addressed, let alone fulfilled. A good starting point for research in forensics, therefore, would be to inventory the unmet agenda of the original Sedalia report.

<sup>4</sup>David A. Thomas, "Sedalia Plus Five: Forensics As Laboratory," in Jack Rhodes and Sara Newell, eds., Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation (SCA: 1980), 245-255.

<sup>5</sup>Jack Rhodes, "On the Current State of Scholarship in Individual Events," Speaker and Gavel, 16 (Fall 1978), p. 17. Prof. Rhodes was commenting on the fact that almost without exception, the material he found was limited to "how to" guidelines, rather than a corpus of research literature. At least, I hope that's what he meant.

<sup>6</sup>Dale Hample, "Forensics Research in the 1980s," The Forensic, 66 (Spring 1981), 20-25. My survey found that all of the researchers he mentioned are continuing the work he noted then.

<sup>7</sup>In preparing this paper, I found two bibliographies to be very useful. First, I was in a privileged position to use an article in press: Russell T. Church and David C. Buckley, eds., "Argumentation and Debating Propositions of Value: A Bibliography," JAJA, 19 (Spring 1983), in press. Second, I used an SCA publication: Ronald J. Matlon, Index to Journals in Communication Studies Through 1979, (1980). Another available bibliography is Church, "A Bibliography of Argumentation and Debate for 1979," JAJA, 17 (Winter 1981), 159-172.

In bringing these references up to date, I relied on my own professional library to a large extent. It is limited by my not having complete files of certain publications to draw upon. These also happen to be periodicals not in the University of Houston library and probably many other libraries, as they are distributed by organizations and groups not routinely ordered by all college library subscription services. In

particular, this paper does not draw upon full volumes of issues of the magazines published by the college forensics honoraries, The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, Speaker and Gavel of DSR-TKA, The Persuader of Phi Rho Pi; also high school publications like The Rostrum of the National Forensic League; Debate ISSUES, published by The Alan Company.

Church's bibliography mentions that Speaker and Gavel published two special issues which would appear to be relevant to this paper: "Forensics in the Seventies: A Retrospective," SPG, 17 (Fall 1979), pp. 1-68; and "Forensics in the Eighties," SPG, 17 (Winter 1980), pp. 69-124; both issues are collections of essays by well known coaches.

The Forensic has also featured special research editions. See the issues for Spring 1981; Fall 1981; Spring 1982; Fall 1982; Spring 1983; and Fall 1983. These came to my attention too late for me to incorporate them into this report, but I am happy to recognize them as repositories for research in various aspects of forensics.

My literature search also ignored the debate handbooks published privately by publishing companies, college workshop staffs, and organizations such as the National Federation of State High School Associations (along with the various state leagues that participate in the Federation). The latest publication by the National Federation, for instance, is Debating United States Justice System: A Preliminary Analysis, edited by Richard G. Fawcett. Its contents include chapters on various aspects of debate theory written by contributors such as Diana Prentice, Jack Kay, John Gossett, Walter Ulrich, and Michael Pfau, among others. Many other established handbook producers also regularly feature discussions of debate analysis in general as well as topic analysis and evidence.

I counted these as "fugitive" sources to a greater or lesser degree in the sense that they are not readily available in research libraries; but nevertheless they could serve as valuable reference sources for forensics theory and research.

I did not include convention papers in my review of available literature, since the accumulation in the last five years is too large, and my own collection of them is very spotty. I did not consult Dissertation Abstracts, even though it is likely that there have been graduate theses dealing with forensics. Nor did I consult a computer information retrieval system such as ERIC, though I probably ought to have. Future surveys of literature will take this step as a matter of routine because of the rapidly growing data banks available, and the increasing ease of using them.

In short, this paper relies largely on academic journal articles and published conference papers such as the proceedings from the Alta summer conferences. To the extent that useful materials are located in the sources I did not consult, this report is incomplete.

<sup>8</sup> During the past five years, several new textbooks on the subject of argumentation and debate have been published. It is with trepidation that the following selection is mentioned, because it is inevitable that it overlooks other new titles which may also belong in a listing of innovative or progressive offerings during this time period. Within the limits of

this selection, each may be said to incorporate recent developments in theory and practice to a greater or lesser extent.

#### DEBATE

Austin Freeley, Argumentation and Debate, 5th Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1981. This latest edition incorporates some discussion of contemporary paradigms into its comprehensive coverage of debate theory and practice.

Carolyn Keefe, Thomas B. Harte, and Laurence B. Norton, eds. Introduction to Debate. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1982. This textbook is a cooperative venture on behalf of Pi Kappa Delta which includes chapters or appendices written by nine other contributors besides those listed as editors. One innovation in this book is an appendix, "Debating Value Propositions," by Don Brownlee.

J. W. Patterson and David Zarefsky, Contemporary Debate. Dallas: Houghton Mifflin, 1983. The first textbook based on a thorough, consistent application of hypothesis testing as the foundation for analysis.

David A. Thomas, ed., Advanced Debate: Readings in Theory, Practice, and Teaching, Revised and Enlarged Ed. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1979. Many of its articles flow from the policy comparison framework, either explicitly or implicitly. However, Part VIII, "New Ideas: The Green Growing Edge," includes articles which deal with hypothesis testing (Henderson, Zarefsky) and argument criticism (Balthrop).

David A. Thomas and Maridell Fryar, Student Congress and Lincoln Douglas Debate. Skokie: National Textbook, 1981. A short textbook which treats analysis of value argumentation in the section on Lincoln Douglas debate.

#### ARGUMENTATION

J. Robert Cox, and Charles A. Willard, eds. Advances in Argumentation Theory and Research. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982. This book contains sixteen contributed articles on various aspects of argumentation theory, together with an extensive bibliography. It was sponsored by the AFA. Reviews of this book have been excellent, and some scholars regard it as a milestone publication in regard to argumentation theory. A call for papers has already been issued by Cox and Willard for another volume to follow up on this book.

Richard D. Rieke, and Malcolm O. Sillars, Argumentation and the Decision Making Process, 2nd Ed. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Co., 1984(?) Unbound galley edition was available for inspection at the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation at Alta, July 28-31, 1983.

J. Michael Sproule, Argument: Language and Its Influence. NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1980.

David Thomas, ed. Argumentation as a Way of Knowing. (1980). 235 pp. SCA, 5105 Backlick Rd., #E, Annandale, VA 22003. This is the publication of the Proceedings of the SCA Seminar on Argumentation held at the 1978

national convention of the SCA. It includes a position paper by Richard Rieke and Stephen Toulmin, eight other contributed papers, and an edited transcript of the discussion conducted by the seminar participants.

Stephen Toulmin, Richard Rieke, and Allan Janik, An Introduction to Reasoning. NY: Macmillan, 1979.

Of these textbooks listed under "Argumentation," the general theme is related to argumentation rather than forensics; only the Sproule book devotes as much as a chapter to academic debate.

9 In the past five years, publications available from both the Speech Communication Association (SCA) and the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) have been of great value and usefulness to forensics researchers.

Three Conferences on Argumentation have now been held at Alta, Utah, under the joint auspices of the SCA and the AFA: in 1979, 1981, and 1983. The Proceedings of each have been edited, bound, and published. The SCA serves as the publisher and distribution outlet. Write to the SCA, 105 Backlick Road, #E, Annandale, VA 22003, for information on ordering copies. The titles of the publications are:

Jack Rhodes and Sara Newell, eds., Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation, 1980. 417 pp. Two conference addresses and some 24 contributed papers are included in the book, of which several are directly or indirectly related to debate and forensics.

George Ziegelmüller and Jack Rhodes, eds., Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation, 1981. 1,030 pp. Sixty-eight contributed papers are listed in its Table of Contents, of which 21 are categorized as "Forensics." Among the forensics papers are several aimed at individual events and value debating, in addition to policy debating.

David Zarefsky, Malcolm O. Sillars, and Jack Rhodes (eds.), Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation. Annandale, VA: SCA, 1983. 954 pp. Sixteen papers appear in this volume, representing three different forensics programs on theory, value/policy comparison, and practice and teaching. Among these sixteen are five on non-policy debate and two on individual events.

For the past four years, Prof. Don Brownlee of California State University, Northridge, has collected articles for publication under the auspices of CEDA. Information about how to obtain copies may be gotten from Prof. Brownlee, or from other leaders and officers of CEDA. The titles of the CEDA publications are:

Brownlee, Don, ed., Perspectives on Non-Policy Argument (1980), 58 pp., 6 papers.

Brownlee, Don, ed., Contributions on the Philosophy and Practices of CEDA (1981), 35 pp., 8 papers.

Brownlee, Don, ed., CEDA Yearbook 1982. 31 pp., 6 papers.

Brownlee, Don, ed., CEDA Yearbook 1983. 39 pp., 8 papers.

Each of these CEDA Yearbooks contains articles contributed by authors representing debate activities both within and without the CEDA organization.

The National Forensic Journal has been in the planning stages for several years. The first issue (Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1983) contains an excellent collection of articles related to the individual events. It deserves wide dissemination within the forensics community. For information regarding subscriptions, contact the editor, Prof. Michael P. Kelley, Dept. of Comm., Cal. State Univ. at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90032.

<sup>10</sup>A reiteration of their perspective appeared in 1980: Allan J. Lichtman and Daniel M. Rohrer, "The Logic of Policy Disputes," JAF, 16 (Spring 1980), 236-247.

<sup>11</sup>JAF, 18 (Winter 1982). The articles were: Robert C. Rowland, "Standards for Paradigm Evaluation," pp. 133-140; David Zarefsky, "The Perils of Assessing Paradigms," pp. 141-144; Allan J. Lichtman and Daniel M. Rohrer, "Policy Dispute and Paradigm Evaluation: A Response to Rowland," pp. 145-150; Walter Ulrich, "Flexibility in Paradigm Evaluation," pp. 151-153. Rowland also wrote a rejoinder entitled, "The Primacy of Standards for Paradigm Evaluation," pp. 154-160.

<sup>12</sup>JAF, 19 (Winter 1983). The articles were: Jerome R. Corsi, "Zarefsky's Theory of Debate as Hypothesis Testing: A Critical Re-Examination," pp. 158-171; Thomas A. Hollihan, "Conditional Arguments and the Hypothesis Testing Paradigm: A Negative View," pp. 171-178; and David Zarefsky and Bill Henderson, "Hypothesis-Testing in Theory and Practice," pp. 179-185. Hollihan wrote a rejoinder, "Conditional Arguments and the Hypothesis Testing Paradigm: A Negative Rebuttal," pp. 186-190.

<sup>13</sup>Michael Pfau, "The Present System Revisited Part One: Incremental Change," JAF, 17 (Fall 1980), 80-84; Pfau, "The Present System Revisited Part Two: Policy Interrelationships," JAF, 17 (Winter 1981), 146-154.

<sup>14</sup>Vincent Follert, "Risk Analysis: Its Application to Argumentation and Decision-Making," JAF, 18 (Fall 1981), 99-108. See also Barry K. Spiker, Tom D. Daniels, and Lawrence M. Bernabo, "The Quantitative Quandary in Forensics: The Use and Abuse of Statistical Evidence," JAF, 19 (Fall 1982), 87-96.

<sup>15</sup>Thomas J. Hynes, Jr., "Can We Save Policy Making," Argument in Transition (1983), pp. 756-771.

<sup>16</sup>Bill Balthrop, "Citizen, Legislator, and Bureaucrat as Evaluators of 'Competing Policy Systems'," in Advanced Debate (1979), 402-418; Balthrop, "Critique," JAF, 18 (Summer 1981), pp. 47-51; and Balthrop, "The Debate Judge as 'Critic of Argument'," JAF, forthcoming.

In fairness, Balthrop's main concern is not to describe a critical escape clause for debates in which there is an issue over competing

paradigms, but to lay out a critical perspective towards rhetorical controversies generally. Since it also accommodates this narrower purpose, I found it convenient to bring it in at this point in my essay.

<sup>17</sup>David B. Hingstman, "Lessons Learned: The Philosophy of Ordinary Language and the Theory of Debate," Argument in Transition, pp. 772-791.

<sup>18</sup>Bruce B. Manchester and Sheryl A. Friedley, "National Championships in Individual Events: A Discussion of the Tournaments Held by The American Forensic Association and The National Forensic Association," JAF, 17 (Fall 1980), 111-119; James J. Lewis and Janet K. Larsen, "Inter-Rater Judge Agreement in Forensic Competition," JAF, 18 (Summer 1981), 9-16; and James A. Benson and Sheryl A. Friedley, "An Empirical Analysis of Evaluation Criteria for Persuasive Speaking," JAF, 19 (Summer 1981), 1-13.

<sup>19</sup>The ten papers included in Dimensions of Argument include:

Colan T. Hanson, "A Search for an Appropriate Argumentative Paradigm," 295-303.

William L. Benoit, "The Role of Argumentative Analysis in Individual Events," 304-309.

Paul C. Gaske, "Argumentative Goals of Individual Events: An Attempt at Definition," 310-324.

Suzanne Larson and Sean Patrick O'Rourke, "Predominant Forms of Argument in Individual Events," 325-337.

Jack Kay, "Evidentiary Concerns in the Community of Individual Events," 338-355.

Kathleen H. Olsen, "Ways That Argument May Be Applied in the Oral Interpretation Events," 356-366.

James W. Pratt, "In What Ways Is Argument Applied in the Non-Prepared Events?" 367-383.

Brenda J. Logue, "In What Ways Is Argument Applied in the Prepared Events?" 384-394.

Bruce B. Manchester and Sheryl A. Friedley, "Do Judging Standards in Individual Events Reflect an Argumentative Perspective?" 395-404.

Michael D. Bartanen, "Are New Events Needed to Enhance a Laboratory Experience in Argumentation?" 405-414.

<sup>20</sup>James H. McBath, ed., Forensics As Communication: The Argumentative Perspective (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1975), p. 12.

<sup>21</sup>The articles dealing with individual events in the premier issue of the National Forensic Journal, 1 (Spring 1981), are:

David A. Thomas, "The Ethics of Proof in Speech Events: A Survey of Standards Used by Contestants and Judges," 1-17.

Norbert H. Mills, "Judging Standards in Forensics: Towards A Uniform Code in the 80's," 19-31.

Donald F. Peters, "Scheduling for Individual Events Nationals: The N. F. A. Experience in Developing Fairness Standards," 33-42.

Hal H. Holloway, et. al., "Report on the Action Caucus on Oral Interpretation in Forensics Competition," 43-58.

<sup>22</sup>John M. Murphy, "Rhetorical Criticism as Argument: A Need for Social Criticism," in Argument in Transition, pp. 918-926.

<sup>23</sup>Jack Kay, "Rapprochement of World<sub>1</sub> and World<sub>2</sub>: Discovering the Ties Between Practical Discourse and Forensics," in Argument in Transition, pp. 927-937.

<sup>24</sup>For example, see Jack H. Howe, "CEDA's Objectives: Lest We Forget," CEDA Yearbook (1981), pp. 1-3; Beverly Merrill Kelley, "An Alternative to NDT Debate," CEDA Yearbook (1981), pp. 8-14.

<sup>25</sup>Many of the references are related to theoretical or analytical subjects. The JAF articles, naturally, are concentrated here. See Ronald J. Matlon, "Debating Propositions of Value," JAF, 14 (Spring 1978), 194-204; Barbara Warrick, "Debating Value Propositions," JAF, 18 (Fall 1981), 109-119; and Carl D. Flaningam, "Value-Centered Argument and the Development of Decision Rules," JAF, 19 (Fall 1982), 107-114.

Likewise, the Alta Conference report in 1981 featured academic treatments of value analysis for debate. See Ronald J. Matlon, "Propositions of Value: An Inquiry into Issue Analysis and the Locus of Presumption," Dimensions of Argument (1981), pp. 494-512; and David A. Thomas and Maridell Fryar, "Value Resolutions, Presumptions, and Stock Issues," Dimensions of Argument (1981), pp. 512-531.

A substantial number (if not a majority) of the articles in Brownlee's annual CEDA Yearbook deal with argumentation theory as related to analysis, issues, paradigms, etc. Some of the titles of articles include:

David Zarefsky, "Criteria for Evaluating Non-Policy Argument," (1980), pp. 9-16; Don Brownlee, "Advocacy and Values," (1980), pp. 43-47; Jan Vasilius, "Value Proposition Debate: A Pragmatic Approach," (1980), 49-59; Raymond Bud Zeuschner, "Value Benefits Analysis as an Affirmative Paradigm," (1982), pp. 16-18; Michael D. Bartanen, "The Role of Values in Policy Controversies," pp. 19-24, 31; Stephen L. Verch and Brenda J. Logue, "Increasing Value Clash: A Propositional and Structural Approach," pp. 25-28; Don R. Swanson, "The Process of Valuing as a Test of the Existence of a Value Claim," (1983), pp. 18-21; Walter Ulrich, "Philosophical Systems as Paradigms for Value Debate," (1983), pp. 22-28; and Dwight Podgurski, "Presumption in the Value Proposition Realm," (1983), pp. 34-39.

<sup>26</sup>Allan D. Loudon and Curtis C. Austin, "CEDA vs. NDT: A Dysfunctional Myth," CEDA Yearbook, (1983), pp. 6-12.

<sup>27</sup>Craig Dudczak, "Value Argument in a Competitive Setting: An Inhibition to Ordinary Language Use," Argument in Transition (1983), pp. 837-844; Robert Rowland, "The Philosophical Presuppositions of Value Debate," Argument in Transition, (1983), pp. 822-836.

<sup>28</sup>Ronald Lee, Karen King Lee, and Matthew Seeger, "Comparison of CEDA and NDT: Differences in Program Characteristics and Director Attitudes," Argument in Transition, (1983), p. 845-857.

<sup>29</sup>Thomas A. Hollihan, Patricia Riley, and Curtis C. Austin, "A Content Analysis of Selected CEDA and NDT Judges' Ballots," Argument in Transition, (1983), pp. 871-882. Incidentally, this is a good example of a qualitative research question, executed with a relatively quantitative method.

<sup>30</sup>David C. Buckley, "A Comparison of Judging Paradigms," Argument in Transition, (1983), pp. 858-870.

<sup>31</sup>Donn W. Parson, "Root Metaphors and Terministic Screens: Another Look at Paradigms," Argument in Transition, (1983), pp. 792-799.

<sup>32</sup>Ronald J. Prochaska's report appears in the Editor's Corner, JAF, 18, (Fall 1981).